

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 42-55 were pending in the application; the status of the claims is as follows:

Claims 42-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,737,014 to Tojo et al (“Tojo”).

Claims 42 and 44-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,162,833 to Taka (“Taka”).

Claims 50-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tojo in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,709,385 to Pfeiler et al (“Pfeiler”).

Claims 50-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taka in view of Pfeiler.

Claim 43 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taka in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,034,804 to Sasaki et al (“Sasaki”).

Claims 43 and 51 have been cancelled.

Claims 42, 47, 50 and 54 have been amended to more clearly describe the invention. These changes do not introduce any new matter.

35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Rejections

The rejection of claims 42-49 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Tojo, is respectfully traversed based on the following.

Tojo discloses an electronic camera having a memory 7 contained in a memory unit 27 that plugs into a slot in imager 1. The system of Tojo also includes an attachable recorder 2 that connects to the imager 1 via electrical connections 36. The Office Action seeks to equate “attachable” with “installed inside,” stating: “since the recorder 2 can be attached to the image pick up apparatus to form a camera apparatus having a body and the first memory and the second memory are installed inside the camera body,” citing Figs 1, 2 and col. 9, line 21- col. 10, line 20. (Office Action p. 7).

Application No. 09/768,667
Amendment dated March 12, 2004
Reply to Office Action of September 24, 2003

Applicants respectfully disagree. Tojo discloses that because the recorder is detachable from the camera, "for the photographer on a walking tour, there is no need to carry the non-solid state memory means of large capacity about with him." (Col. 2, lines 26-29). If, as the Office Action contends, the non-solid state memory means were "installed inside" the camera of Tojo, there would be no reduction in the size of the camera for the "photographer on a walking tour." Rather, as clearly illustrated in Figure 3, since the non-solid state memory means of Tojo is simply attached to the outside of the camera, it can be attached or detached by the photographer based upon his needs. By detaching the non-solid state memory means, the size of Tojo's camera can be significantly reduced. Thus, the non-solid state memory of Tojo is external to the imager, and cannot be equated with the first and second memory of claim 42 which are "installed inside" the camera body. Further, with respect to claim 47, the non-solid state memory of Tojo is external to the imager and thus cannot be equated with the first and second recording medium, which are "mounted inside" the camera body.

Claims 44-46, 48, and 49 depend from and contain all the limitations of their respective independent claims. Thus, Tojo also fails to anticipate claims 44-46, 48, and 49.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 42 and 44-49 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Tojo, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 42 and 44-49 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Taka, is respectfully traversed based on the following.

The Office Action states that Taka discloses a first memory and a second memory (recall memory and special memory), and that it is "clear that the first memory and second memory are inside the body of the camera." (Office Action p. 8).

Applicants respectfully disagree. While Taka discloses the first and second memory, Taka does not disclose their position with respect to the camera. Further, Taka

Application No. 09/768,667
Amendment dated March 12, 2004
Reply to Office Action of September 24, 2003

does not disclose that one of the first and second memory is “detachably” installed or mounted “inside the camera body,” i.e., that the memory can be detached or removed from the camera. In contrast, claim 42 requires that the first memory be “detachably installed inside the camera body.” Taka does not disclose this limitation and thus cannot anticipate claim 42. With respect to claim 47, Taka does not disclose a first recording medium “detachably mounted inside the camera body.” Thus, Taka also cannot anticipate claim 47.

Claims 44-46, 48 and 49 depend from and contain all the limitations of their respective independent claims. Thus, Taka also fails to anticipate claims 44-46, 48 and 49.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 42 and 44-49 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Taka, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

The rejection of claims 50-55 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Tojo in view of Pfeiler, is respectfully traversed based on the following.

The Office Action admits that Tojo fails to disclose “the use of a buffer memory for storing the image from the first memory or the second memory” but cites the teachings of Pfeiler for this proposition. Pfeiler fails to rectify the deficiencies of Tojo in that Pfeiler fails to disclose “a first memory, detachably mountable inside the camera body” as required by claim 50. Thus, claim 50 is considered novel and non-obvious over Tojo and Pfeiler, individually or in combination.

With respect to claim 54, Pfeiler also fails to disclose “a first recording medium detachably mountable inside the camera body” as required by claim 54. Thus, claim 54 is considered novel and non-obvious over Tojo and Pfeiler, individually or in combination.

Application No. 09/768,667
Amendment dated March 12, 2004
Reply to Office Action of September 24, 2003

Claims 52, 53 and 55 depend from and contain all the limitations of their respective independent claims. Thus, claims 52, 53 and 55 are novel and non-obvious over Tojo and Pfeiler for at least the same reasons as claims 50 and 54 are novel and non-obvious.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 50-55 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tojo in view of Pfeiler, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 50-55 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Taka in view of Pfeiler, is respectfully traversed based on the following.

The Office Action admits that Taka fails to disclose “a memory for receiving the images from the first memory or second memory” but cites the teachings of Pfeiler for this proposition. Pfeiler fails to rectify the deficiencies of Taka in that Pfeiler fails to disclose a first memory detachably mountable inside the camera body as required by claim 50. Thus, claim 50 is considered novel and non-obvious over Taka and Pfeiler, individually or in combination.

With respect to claim 54, Pfeiler also fails to disclose a first recording medium detachably mountable inside the camera body as required by claim 54. Thus, claim 54 is considered novel and non-obvious over Taka and Pfeiler, individually or in combination.

Claims 52, 53 and 55 depend from and contain all the limitations of their respective independent claims. Thus, claims 52, 53 and 55 are novel and non-obvious over Taka and Pfeiler for at least the same reasons as claims 50 and 54 are novel and non-obvious.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 50-55 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taka in view of Pfeiler, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Application No. 09/768,667
Amendment dated March 12, 2004
Reply to Office Action of September 24, 2003

Claim 43 has been cancelled. Thus the rejection of claim 43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taka in view of Sasaki is moot.

CONCLUSION

Wherefore, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is considered to be in condition for allowance, and an early reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

This Amendment does not increase the number of independent claims, does not increase the total number of claims, and does not present any multiple dependency claims. Accordingly, no fee based on the number or type of claims is currently due. However, if a fee, other than the issue fee, is due, please charge this fee to Sidley Austin Brown & Wood LLP's Deposit Account No. 18-1260.

Any fee required by this document other than the issue fee, and not submitted herewith should be charged to Sidley Austin Brown & Wood LLP's Deposit Account No. 18-1260. Any refund should be credited to the same account.

If an extension of time is required to enable this document to be timely filed and there is no separate Petition for Extension of Time filed herewith, this document is to be construed as also constituting a Petition for Extension of Time Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) for a period of time sufficient to enable this document to be timely filed.

Any other fee required for such Petition for Extension of Time and any other fee required by this document pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17, other than the issue fee,

Application No. 09/768,667
Amendment dated March 12, 2004
Reply to Office Action of September 24, 2003

and not submitted herewith should be charged to Sidley Austin Brown & Wood LLP's Deposit Account No. 18-1260. Any refund should be credited to the same account.

Respectfully submitted,

By:


Tung T. Nguyen
Registration No. 42,935
Attorney for Applicants

TTN/lb:bar
SIDLEY AUSTIN BROWN & WOOD LLP
717 N. Harwood, Suite 3400
Dallas, Texas 75201
Direct: (214) 981-3482
Main: (214) 981-3300
Facsimile: (214) 981-3400
March 12, 2004

DA1 274951v4